

REMARKS

1. In the above-captioned Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification. Claims 4, 12-15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 16-19, 21-24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Rundberg (U.S. Patent No. 2,225,961). Claims 9, 13-15, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Rundberg. Claims 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Rundberg in view of Williams (U.S. Patent No. 4,223,377). These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

2. The telephone interview on July 12, 2005 with the Examiner and the Supervising Examiner is appreciated.

3. The Examiner objected to the specification. The Examiner pointed out typographical errors in paragraphs 2, 16, and 17 that are corrected above.

4. Claims 4, 12-15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

With respect to claims 4 and 19, the Examiner stated that "having a non-standard interface to a fastening tool" was indefinite. Support for this phrase is found, for example, in paragraph 18 of the specification and FIG. 4. Claims 4 and 19 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 12-15 were rejected as being indefinite. Claims 12-15 are amended above and are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

5. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 16-19, 21-24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Rundberg. Claims 9, 13-15, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Rundberg. Claims 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Rundberg in view of Williams.

None of the references cited teaches or suggests *a support member mountable to the wall and to the enclosure, wherein the support member has a dimension larger than the enclosure, such that the apparatus resists removal from the wall, as set*

forth in independent claim 1, *a support member mountable to the wall and to the enclosure and extending beyond the enclosure such that the apparatus resists removal from the wall nor fire-resistant material disposed on the enclosure*, as set forth in independent claim 16, *nor a support member fastened to the enclosure, having at least one part extending beyond the enclosure, and mountable to the wall, such that the apparatus resists removal from the wall*, as set forth in independent claim 18.

Claims 2-15, 17, and 19-26 are dependent upon an independent claim that is shown to be allowable. Thus, the dependent claims are themselves allowable.

6. The Applicant amends claims 1, 16, and 18 above. The amendment of claims 1, 16, and 18 is not an admission that Rundberg and/or Williams teaches or renders the claims obvious. The amendment instead reflects the Applicant's desire to expeditiously proceed and prosecute the resulting claims in this application.

7. No new subject matter is introduced by the amendments to the above claims or specification or the addition of the new claims.

8. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication may advance the prosecution of the present application. Notice of allowance of claims 1-26 is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2005

By: Susan L. Lukasik
Susan L. Lukasik
Registration No. 35,261
Attorney for Applicant
Voice: (630) 620-1312